

MIGRANT AND SEASONAL FARMWORKER
ENUMERATION PROFILES STUDY

MISSISSIPPI

FINAL

prepared for the

**Migrant Health Program
Bureau of Primary Health Care
Health Resources and Services Administration**

by

**Alice C. Larson, Ph.D.
Larson Assistance Services**

P.O. Box 801
Vashon Island, WA 98070
206-463-9000 (voice)
206-463-9400 (fax)
las@wolfenet.com (e-mail)

September, 2000

PREFACE

The mission of the Bureau of Primary Health Care (BPHC), Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services is to increase access to comprehensive primary and preventive health care and to improve the health status of under served and vulnerable populations. To achieve this mission the Migrant Health Program (MHP), BPHC provides support to organizations which offer technical assistance to or directly deliver primary health care services to migrant and seasonal farmworkers (MSFWs). In order to better plan, develop and evaluate health care service delivery and utilization, information is needed on the numbers and distribution of farmworkers at the national, state, and county levels. Moreover, the legislation which authorizes the Migrant Health Program, Section 330g of the Public Health Service Act, requires that priorities for assistance be assigned to areas where the greatest need exists. Therefore, the MHP periodically seeks to obtain updated information about MSFWs; where they are working and living and what crops are being harvested, in order to more appropriately target limited resources to areas of greatest MSFW need.

These MHP enumeration reports are some of the few sources offering MSFW estimates at the county level. The last time such data was published by the MHP was in March 1990 with "An ATLAS of State Profiles Which Estimate Number of Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers and Members of Their Families."

This time with the Office of Pesticide Programs, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency as a funding partner, the MHP awarded a grant to the National Center for Farmworker Health, Inc. (NCFH). The NCFH consequently contracted with Alice C. Larson, Ph.D. of Larson Assistance Services to research and develop state estimates.

In the previous publication "ATLAS of State Profiles" the counting of MSFWs was done on a state-by-state basis which depended on the available data resources within each state, then a consultant was used to validate each state's submission. For this publication, Dr. Larson, assisted by a team of consultants, used a systematic approach to estimate the number of farmworkers included under the MHP definition. Please note that in this document farmworker dependents and family members within their households are labeled "non-farmworkers" although they are clearly included in the MHP definition. This research included the determination of the number of workers needed for specific seasonal hand labor tasks, and the examination of state employment records, local sources of information and large-scale databases (i.e., the National Agricultural Workers Survey of the U.S. Department of Labor, the National Farmworker Database of the Association of Farmworker Opportunity Programs, the Uniform Data System of the Bureau of Primary Health Care and

the Census of Agriculture of the Bureau of the Census and U.S. Department of Agriculture). A major part of this effort involved the review of draft estimates by local and national knowledgeable individuals.

In this document, the MHP presents currently updated MSFW information beginning with ten states: Arkansas, California, Florida, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas and Washington. The MHP hopes to continue these collaborative efforts with other federal agencies and organizations in order to update the remaining states impacted and benefiting by the labor of our Nation's farmworkers.

Readers may wish to address questions or comments concerning these state estimates directly to Alice C. Larson, Ph.D., P.O. Box 801, Vashon Island, WA 98070 or via e-mail to las@wolfenet.com. It is our hope and expectation that all federal, state, local public and private entities providing services to MSFWs will use this state and county specific enumeration data to plan, develop and implement improved services to our Nation's farmworkers.

The Migrant Health Program, BPHC gratefully acknowledges the efforts of the many groups across the nation who have made this publication possible. Our thanks not only to those who directly reviewed and commented on the estimates, but to those who participated and assisted along the way.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Adolfo Mata', with a stylized, flowing script.

Adolfo Mata, Chief
Migrant Health Program
Division of Community and Migrant Health
Bureau of Primary Health Care
Health Resources and Services Administration
Department of Health & Human Services

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research team is extremely grateful to the many people in Mississippi who offered information, data and suggestions that helped make this study possible. In addition, those who took the time to review draft documents offered a major contribution to improving the end result.

Estimating migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their non-farmworker household members is an extremely challenging task. This research has attempted to examine existing data and develop a reasonable approach to the estimation process. The user should carefully consider the description of study parameters to understand what is included or excluded from the final figures and the limitations of the research.

It is hoped this document will be found to be helpful in meeting the need for descriptive information on the migrant and seasonal farmworker population.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	
A. Background	1
B. Study Purpose	1
C. Definition	1
D. Limitations	2
E. General Process	2
F. Enumeration Methodology	4
G. Resources Utilized for Mississippi Estimates	7
TABLES	
Mississippi MSFW Enumeration Profiles Estimates – Final	13
Mississippi Demand for Labor Factors – Final	16
MAPS	
MSFW Estimates by County, Workers Only	17
Estimates for MSFW Workers and Non-Workers by County	18
BIBLIOGRAPHY	19

DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION

A. BACKGROUND

The Migrant Health Program of the Bureau of Primary Health Care, Health Resources and Services Administration, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services has periodically undertaken an estimation of the population targeted for services by federally funded Migrant Health Centers. The results have helped better plan service utilization including determining if resources are appropriate to the need and identification of unserved areas. Four such studies have previously been undertaken; the last was published in 1990, *The Migrant Health Atlas*.

The Migrant Health Program is updating this information beginning with ten states: Arkansas, California, Florida, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Texas and Washington. Final reports, titled “Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Enumeration Profiles Study” (MSFW EPS) were prepared for each target state.

The National Center for Farmworker Health was engaged by the Migrant Health Program to act as its agent in securing, monitoring and finalizing an end product. In July 1998, agreement was reached with Larson Assistance Services to research and develop state estimates. Alice C. Larson, Ph.D., with the assistance of a team of consultants, is responsible for this document containing MSFW estimates for Mississippi

B. STUDY PURPOSE

The MSFW EPS offers state-based information at the county level for the following three population sub-groups:

- Migrant farmworkers and seasonal farmworkers.
- Non-farmworkers present in the same household as migrant farmworkers and seasonal farmworkers (defined by the term “accompanied”).
- Number of people (“children and youth”) under age 20 in six age groups.

C. DEFINITION

The MSFW definition used for this study is that of the Migrant Health Program. It

describes a seasonal farmworker as:

“An individual whose principal employment [51% of time] is in agriculture on a seasonal basis, who has been so employed within the last twenty-four months.”

A migrant farmworker meets the same definition but “establishes for the purposes of such employment a temporary abode.” (*U.S. Code*, Public Health Services Act, “Migrant Health”)

Included in the scope of study are individuals engaged in field and orchard agriculture; packing and sorting procedures in food processing; horticultural specialties (including nursery operations, greenhouse activities and crops grown under cover); and reforestation. Excluded from study are those working with livestock, poultry, and fisheries.

D. LIMITATIONS

This study is limited in scope in that only secondary source material, including existing database information, and knowledgeable individuals, have been utilized to generate information. This has meant taking reports and databases prepared for other purposes and adjusting them, as possible, for the MSFW EPS. Limited resources and time have prohibited primary research directly with farmworkers.

In addition, by employing only secondary source information, the definition of who is included as a migrant or seasonal farmworker is often tied to the parameters used by the generating source. Wherever possible, screens were used to exclude those not covered by the Migrant Health Program definition.

E. GENERAL PROCESS

1. Basic Investigation Techniques

The research conducted within each state had four major phases:

- (1) Basic data gathering and preparation of First Draft Estimate.
- (2) Review by local knowledgeable individuals and revision of First Draft Estimate.
- (3) Completion of Second Draft Estimate and additional review by a wider audience of knowledgeable individuals.
- (4) Revision as necessary and issuance of Final Estimate.

2. National Databases

Prior to completion of any state profile, two national databases were analyzed specifically for this study. They represent the two largest continuous direct surveys of MSFWs in the country as of 1999.

The National Farmworker Database (NFD) of the Association of Farmworker Opportunity Programs contains information on clients eligible for services at job training programs targeted to MSFWs (Workforce Investment Act – WIA 167 Programs; formerly JTPA 402 Programs). This database, tied to programs throughout the country, contains 65,000 individuals and includes basic demographic, family characteristic and work history information. Figures from 1994 through August 1998 were used for this study and provided national and some state data.

The National Agricultural Workers Survey (NAWS) of the U.S. Department of Labor (coordinated by Aguirre International) is a survey conducted three times annually gathering similar information through random selection of targeted counties, employers and subjects. Demographic, family and work history information is similar to the NFD. Data for a five-year period (1993-97) were used in the MSFW EPS, which included over 11,000 respondents offering national and regional information.

A third national database used to develop factor information was Migrant Health Program statistics prepared annually by each federally funded migrant health center. These gave the number of migrant farmworker and seasonal farmworker patients served. Data for 1996 and 1997, where available, were averaged.

3. State Specific Steps

Work on each target state began with a mass mailing to identified service organizations assisting MSFWs, government agencies involved with agriculture, farm employer and crop commodity groups, special interagency MSFW committees and others. These included: migrant health centers, primary care associations, migrant education programs, migrant head start programs, legal services, job training programs, housing assistance centers, grower associations, extension service and agricultural economics departments of state land grant universities and other agents. State government agencies involved with agriculture, education, employment, forestry, health, labor and welfare were contacted.

Each was sent an introductory letter and questionnaire listing study factors for which information was sought. Those contacted were asked to provide anything they might have directly or list other resource documents or personnel.

Follow-up contacts were made with numerous individuals and internet sites from a variety of programs and agencies (a range of 14-54 for each of the ten target states) looking for state-specific information such as client-related demographics, enrollment data, crop production figures and acreage statistics. Although many different individuals, agencies, organizations and businesses were contacted, the list was in no way exhaustive of all of those involved with agriculture and MSFWs in each state. It is expected most of the key knowledgeable individuals were reached, many of whom were identified by questionnaire respondents.

Once all state specific information was received, factor information was extracted. Sources were compared and analyzed to account for any differences. Results were contrasted against national database information and conclusions drawn regarding the best factor, data range or average to use. Draft estimates and maps were then prepared for review.

4. Review of Draft Estimates

The Draft One document was sent out for review to knowledgeable individuals in the state who had provided information for preparation of the estimates, assisted in some other manner, or expressed an interest in receiving a copy.

Reviewers were asked to comment on methodological steps, resources utilized and factors employed. If they found something they felt was incorrect, they were requested to offer suggestions for improvement in the form of specific information which could be incorporated into the estimates. Where clarification was needed after receipt of comments, direct conversation or exchange of correspondence were utilized to assure a complete understanding of the issues raised or obtain additional information. Often additional research was necessary to determine the appropriate direction to correct the estimates.

After consideration of all issues raised from a variety of sources, revisions were made as necessary. Draft Two estimates, tables, maps and supporting documents were then prepared and shared with Draft One reviewers as well as other local and national sources. Comments were again incorporated into the Final Report. In all, five people helped review and refine the Mississippi estimates and document.

F. ENUMERATION METHODOLOGY

The four separate industry classifications within the study MSFW definition; field agriculture, nursery/greenhouse -- crops grown under cover, food processing and reforestation; were each addressed differently. An adjustment was made to final

worker estimates to account for duplicate counts within and across counties. Finally, population sub-groups and children's and youth's ages were calculated.

1. Field Agriculture

The field agriculture estimate used a “demand for labor” (DFL) process that examines the number of workers needed to perform temporary agricultural tasks, primarily harvesting. The results estimate full-time equivalent (FTE) workers required for the task during the period of peak labor demand. Calculations, prepared for each county, are derived through a formula using four elements:

$$DFL = \frac{A \times H}{W \times S}$$

Where:

A = crop acreage.

H = hours needed to perform a specific task (e.g., harvest) on one acre of the crop.

W = work hours per farmworker per day during maximum activity.

S = season length for peak work activity.

2. Nursery/Greenhouse and Crops Grown Under Cover

Nursery/greenhouse workers and those involved in crops grown under cover were more difficult to estimate than workers in field agriculture as many different categories fall within these classifications. This includes: bedding plants, cut flowers, florist greens, floriculture, flower seed crops, foliage plants, greenhouse vegetables, mushroom production, potted flowering plants, sod and vegetable seed crops. Some products are grown in covered structures while others are raised in open acreage. Tasks differ with the type of product and production needs.

For these industry categories, the best resource was found to be direct employment reports. Statewide monthly figures were used to subtract the lowest employment month from the highest month to obtain a rough estimate of “temporary” laborers. Results for a three-year period were averaged to avoid any aberration attributable to a single year. The county proportion of the state acreage and enclosed space total for nursery/greenhouse operations and crops grown under cover was calculated and multiplied by the statewide employment estimate to determine each county's temporary worker share.

3. Food Processing

Those employed temporarily in the food processing industry are also very difficult to estimate. Examination was made of many sources to assess both the extent of employment and distribution by county.

Three Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes were identified as most likely to meet the Migrant Health Program definition used in this study. Information specific to relevant companies in each county was pulled from a national directory of food processors. This provided estimates of total number of employees.

The same source used to estimate nursery/greenhouse workers provided the average highest and lowest monthly employment figures for food processing employees. This information was only available statewide. Calculations were made to determine the percent of temporary to permanent workers. This percentage was applied to each county in the respective state to estimate the number of temporary food processing workers.

4. Reforestation

Reforestation activity is different from work in the other industry classifications as stands of trees are left to grow from five to forty-five years or longer. This means only a proportion of timberland in a state is engaged by tree planters each year. As the exact location of this labor differs annually, a worker estimate can only be provided on a statewide basis.

A DFL approach was taken to estimate tree planters using statewide data. Research found two different sets of factors for the DFL elements. Accordingly, two estimates were prepared resulting in a range. The final worker figure became the midpoint of this estimation range.

5. Adjustment for Duplication

An adjustment was made to account for those employed in more than one job covered by the MSFW definition. This involved dividing all worker estimates by a factor for average jobs per MSFW. These adjusted county estimates could then be more appropriately added to develop a state total.

6. Sub-Group Estimates

Sub-groups estimated for the study included migrant farmworkers, seasonal

farmworkers, non-farmworker family members accompanying farmworkers and children and youth in specified age groups. Migrant farmworkers encompassed individuals who migrated only within the state (intrastate migrants), and those who traveled out of state for farm work (interstate migrants).

Both “non-farmworkers” and “children and youth” were estimated. The first group included anyone of any age in the household who was not employed in farm work. The latter group covered anyone in the household from ages less than one through nineteen. Although the category “children and youth” involves those of a young age who would be considered non-farmworkers, it also includes older individuals who may be farmworkers.

Sub-group calculations were made, at a county level, as follows:

- Apply percent identified as migrant workers and percent identified as seasonal workers to adjusted MSFW estimates.
- Determine the percent of each sub-group, migrant workers and seasonal workers, accompanied. This is as opposed to workers who represent single person households; for example, 14 unrelated men living in one household would represent 14 single person households.
- Divide the group of accompanied workers by the average number of farmworkers per household to determine the number of accompanied households.
- Multiply the number of accompanied households by the average number of other members per household to derive the number of “non-farmworkers.”

The following age groupings were determined to be the most useful descriptors for the population considered “children and youth,” given the needs of funding sources and health care programs: under 1 year, 1-4, 5-12, 13-14, 15-18, and 19. Factors were found for the number of individuals in each accompanied household who were less than 20 years old. These were multiplied by the estimate of accompanied migrant and seasonal households to find total number of migrant and seasonal children and youth. A variety of sources were then examined to derive percent of the population in each age group.

G. RESOURCES UTILIZED FOR MISSISSIPPI ESTIMATES

Factor information was gathered from the primary sources listed below. In addition and where available, local information was utilized as a check or as a replacement for broader national or regional data.

1. Field Agriculture

Crops Requiring Temporary Hand Laborers: NFD and NAWS direct survey data on respondent work history were examined in the NFD and at the regional level in the NAWS to determine the crops and tasks worked. Because not much detail on workers in Mississippi is included in the NFD, the neighboring states of Alabama, Arkansas and Louisiana in the same region were also examined. This information was then discussed with local knowledgeable experts including individuals from the Mississippi Agricultural Statistical Service, and Mississippi State University Cooperative Extension Service. A publication from the Mississippi State University Cooperative Extension Service, "Commercial Horticulture Acreage by Counties – 1998" was very helpful in identifying crops grown in the State.

The "Horticulture Acreage" report listed pole beans and bush beans as grown in Mississippi. Information from a University of Florida source (Smith and Taylor, 1997) indicates bush beans are normally mechanically harvested. Accordingly, estimates were only made for pole beans. Southern peas that were mechanically harvested were excluded from the estimates.

Acreage: 1997 Census of Agriculture (COA) acreage for identified hand labor crops by county was used. After discussion with agricultural experts and others, it was determined crops of fewer than ten acres are less likely to employ hired workers and more likely to have tasks performed by family members.

Accordingly, any crop noting such small acreage within a county was dropped. The one exception to this rule was tomatoes. Discussion with a knowledgeable expert at Mississippi State University (Nagel, 1998) concluded tomatoes grown on more than two acres usually requires harvest by hired temporary laborers.

Hours for Task: "Crop budgets" and other special reports prepared by agricultural economists and extension specialists as a guide to crop production were utilized to determine hours needed to perform major hand labor tasks on each crop. The *Migrant Enumeration Project, 1993* (Larson and Plascencia) had updated earlier 1970s-80s estimates. These were supplemented through a search of additional budgets specific to the study target states.

Work Hours: The NAWS was found to be the only national source for hours per week and days per week worked by MSFWs. The latest five-year averages showed 38.6 hours/week during a five-day work week. The resulting 7.7 hours/day factor was used in the calculation.

Season Length: Information on peak hand labor season was obtained from the *Migrant Enumeration Project* with updates from state specific publications from the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The Mississippi Agricultural Statistics

Service web site offered information for cotton and sweet potatoes. Calendar days were converted to work days by dividing the total number by seven to determine number of weeks and then multiplying by five for number of average MSFW work days per week (as noted in NAWs data).

2. Nursery/Greenhouse and Crops Grown Under Cover

The "Employment and Wages Monthly Employment," *ES 202* report (U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics) provided monthly employment totals for SIC 0181: nursery/greenhouse – ornamental floriculture and nursery products; and SIC 0182: food crops grown under cover including mushrooms. The estimate used the difference between highest and lowest monthly employment figures averaged for the three year period, 1995-1997. The result yielded a statewide figure.

County data from the 1997 COA for nursery and greenhouse acres in the open and square feet under glass were used to proportion the state nursery/greenhouse worker estimate into counties. COA figures for mushroom and greenhouse vegetable acreage and square feet under glass were similarly used to proportion the statewide estimate for crops grown under cover.

3. Food Processing

Two separate methods were used for estimating food processing workers within the three SICs.

ES 202 reports for SIC 2033 (canned fruits and vegetables) and SIC 2037 (frozen fruits, fruit juices and vegetables) were utilized in a technique similar to the estimate for nursery/greenhouse workers but to derive the percent difference between high and low monthly employment. This was taken to represent percent of total employed that could be considered temporary workers within these two SIC industry classifications.

Information from the *Directory of Canning, Freezing, Preserving Industries, 1998-99* (Edward E. Judge and Sons) determined companies engaged in activities within these two SICs and a range for total employment at each site. The mid-point of this range was used to represent exact number of employees. City locations were attributed to counties as cross-referenced in *Bullinger's 1997 Postal and Shippers Guide* (Alfer Leland). Total food processing employment per county was tabulated, and the percent calculated to be temporary workers within each county was applied.

For SIC 0723 (crop preparation for market), the ES 202 high/low employment reports were utilized to determine number of statewide temporary workers,

similar to the nursery/greenhouse estimation process. This was then allocated to counties on the percentage share used for the other two food processing SICs.

4. Reforestation

For each of the two different estimates made for reforestation workers, the same resource was used for two of the DFL factors:

Acreage information was obtained from *Tree Planting in the United States*, an annual publication of the United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. The years 1992-1996 created a five-year average.

Work Hours were generally agreed to be eight per day as reported by various forestry experts.

The DFL factors “hours for task” and “season length” differed for each estimate and came from the following two sources.

(1) *Number and Characteristics of Migrants in Mississippi* (Larson, 1992), presented tree planting DFL characteristics from field research discussion with knowledgeable experts. This source reported: 1½ acres of seedlings planted per 8 hour day or 5.33 hours/acre; 73 days peak season length, calculated at 13 weeks working an average 6 days/week minus 5 days during the season in which weather conditions would prohibit work.

(2) Conversation with Michael Economopoulos, South Eastern Forestry Contractors Association (1998), reported the following factor information: 3 acres planted per 8 hour day or 2.67 hours/acre; 40 days season length, calculated at 8 weeks for an average of 5 days/week.

5. Adjustment Factor

No data on jobs per county or jobs per state could be located. The only information found was from both NFD and NAWS for average jobs/worker for approximately a twelve-month period. For lack of better factor information, the resulting figures from these two sources, at a national level, were averaged to derive a factor of 1.665 jobs/worker.

6. Sub-Groups

Migrant/Seasonal: Three sources were averaged for the migrant and seasonal percent of the total worker population: NFD regional average for Alabama, Arkansas and Louisiana; NAWS regional data; and information reported to the

Bureau of Primary Health Care for two Mississippi federally funded health centers. The results were 32.6% migrant farmworkers; 67.4% seasonal farmworkers.

Additional discussion with knowledgeable experts suggested fewer migrants were present in eight counties. Accordingly, the following changes were made:

- Chickasaw, Sharkey, Simpson, Tallahatchi and Tunica Counties – reduced migrant percent to 16.3%; increased seasonal to 83.7%.
- Holmes, Madison and Yazoo Counties – reduced migrant percent to 0%; increased seasonal to 100.0%

Accompanied: Calculations for the percentage of migrant workers accompanied by relatives and seasonal workers residing in multiple person families used: NFD regional averages, NAWS regional information and, for migrants, a calculation from data supplied by the Mississippi Migrant Education Program. The latter source was determined by estimating the total number of migrant workers represented by Migrant Education Program figures as a percentage of the estimated total number of migrant workers. The resulting average of the three sources found 39.8% migrants accompanied and 61.2% seasonals accompanied.

Farmworkers Per Household: The only source available to estimate farmworkers per household was NAWS regional information. This reported 2.01 farmworkers per accompanied household for migrants and 1.85 for seasonals.

Non-Farmworkers Per Household: An average of two sources was used to determine migrant and seasonal household size: NFD regional average and NAWS regional factors. Farmworkers per household were subtracted to calculate non-farmworkers per household: 1.70 for migrants, 1.90 for seasonals.

7. Children and Youth by Age Groups

“Children and youth,” as defined in the MSFW EPS are those ages infant through 19. Whether or not these individuals perform farm work does not matter for purposes of this calculation, and therefore, the group “MSFW farmworkers” and the group “children and youth” are not mutually exclusive.

NAWS national figures on children and youth per household were used to determine the number of those under 20 years of age (1.50 for migrants; 1.53 for seasonals). The result found 981 migrant; 4,282 seasonal children and youth.

These individuals were divided into the following age groups using percentages from regional NAWS information:

Migrants: under 1 = 8.8%, ages 1-4 = 34.1%, ages 5-12 = 32.9%, ages 13-14 = 8.5%, ages 15-18 = 10.0%, and age 19 = 5.7%.

Seasonals: under 1 = 3.7%, ages 1-4 = 25.9%, ages 5-12 = 37.0%, ages 13-14 = 10.4%, ages 15-18 = 18.2%, and age 19 = 4.8%.

TABLE ONE
MISSISSIPPI MSFW ENUMERATION PROFILES ESTIMATES
FINAL

FIELD AGRICULTURE, NURSERY/GREENHOUSE AND FOOD PROCESSING

County	Adjusted MSFW Farmworker Estimate	Migrant Farmworkers	Seasonal Farmworkers	Non-Farmworkers In Migrant Households	Non-Farmworkers In Seasonal Households	MSFW Farmworkers And Non-Farmworkers
Adams	32	10	22	4	14	49
Alcorn	31	10	21	3	13	48
Amite	33	11	22	4	14	51
Attala	82	27	55	9	35	126
Benton	19	6	12	2	8	28
Bolivar	500	163	337	55	212	767
Calhoun	1,041	339	701	114	441	1,595
Carroll	103	34	69	11	44	158
Chickasaw	255	42	213	14	134	403
Choctaw	9	3	6	1	4	13
Claiborne	27	9	18	3	11	41
Clarke	9	3	6	1	4	14
Clay	26	9	18	3	11	40
Coahoma	654	213	441	72	277	1,003
Copiah	19	6	13	2	8	29
Covington	111	36	75	12	47	170
DeSoto	115	37	78	13	49	176
Forrest	66	22	45	7	28	102
Franklin	5	2	4	1	2	8
George	160	52	108	18	68	245
Greene	20	6	13	2	8	30
Grenada	56	18	38	6	24	86
Hancock	75	24	50	8	32	114
Harrison	64	21	43	7	27	99
Hinds	152	50	103	17	64	233
Holmes	263	0	263	0	165	428
Humphreys	416	136	280	46	176	638
Issaquena	141	46	95	15	60	216
Itawamba	20	6	13	2	8	30
Jackson	141	46	95	15	60	216
Jasper	1	0	0	0	0	1
Jefferson Davis	62	20	42	7	26	95
Jefferson	24	8	16	3	10	37
Jones	57	18	38	6	24	87
Kemper	6	2	4	1	2	9
Lafayette	56	18	38	6	24	86
Lamar	221	72	149	24	94	339
Lauderdale	17	5	11	2	7	25
Lawrence	0	0	0	0	0	0
Leake	18	6	12	2	8	28
Lee	51	17	34	6	21	78
Leflore	525	171	354	58	222	805
Lincoln	0	0	0	0	0	0

County	Adjusted MSFW Farmworker Estimate	Migrant Farmworkers	Seasonal Farmworkers	Non- Farmworkers In Migrant Households	Non- Farmworkers In Seasonal Households	MSFW Farmworkers And Non- Farmworkers
Lowndes	48	16	32	5	20	74
Madison	206	0	206	0	129	335
Marion	24	8	16	3	10	37
Marshall	28	9	19	3	12	43
Monroe	89	29	60	10	38	136
Montgomery	78	25	52	9	33	119
Neshoba	3	1	2	0	1	5
Newton	2	1	1	0	1	3
Noxubee	43	14	29	5	18	67
Oktibbeha	53	17	36	6	22	81
Panola	193	63	130	21	82	296
Pearl River	171	56	115	19	72	262
Perry	9	3	6	1	4	14
Pike	15	5	10	2	6	23
Pontotoc	67	22	45	7	29	103
Prentiss	15	5	10	2	7	24
Quitman	203	66	137	22	86	312
Rankin	53	17	36	6	23	81
Scott	13	4	9	1	6	20
Sharkey	261	42	218	14	137	412
Simpson	41	7	34	2	21	64
Smith	129	42	87	14	55	198
Stone	36	12	24	4	15	55
Sunflower	456	149	307	50	193	699
Tallahatchie	507	83	424	28	267	801
Tate	53	17	36	6	22	81
Tippah	6	2	4	1	2	9
Tishomingo	5	2	4	1	2	8
Tunica	291	47	244	16	153	461
Union	16	5	11	2	7	24
Walthall	1	0	1	0	0	1
Warren	80	26	54	9	34	123
Washington	690	225	465	76	292	1,058
Wayne	104	34	70	11	44	160
Webster	111	36	75	12	47	170
Wilkinson	5	2	3	1	2	8
Winston	14	4	9	1	6	21
Yalobusha	85	28	57	9	36	130
Yazoo	486	0	486	0	306	792
Total State	10,368	2,848	7,520	959	4,727	16,054
Reforestation						
Total State	1,394	454	940	153	591	2,138
Grand State Total	11,762	3,302	8,460	1,112	5,317	18,191

NOTES:

County numbers have been rounded and, therefore, may not exactly add to totals.

CHILDREN AND YOUTH BY AGE GROUPS (STATEWIDE)


Age Groups	Migrant Percent	Number of Migrant Children	Seasonal Percent	Number of Seasonal Children
< 1	8.8%	86	3.7%	158
1-4	34.1%	335	25.9%	1,109
5-12	32.9%	323	37.0%	1,584
13-14	8.5%	83	10.4%	445
15-18	10.0%	98	18.2%	779
19	5.7%	56	4.8%	206
Total	100.0%	981	100.0%	4,282

NOTE: "Children and Youth" are defined as those under 20 years of age. Some children may be farmworkers.

TABLE TWO
MISSISSIPPI DEMAND FOR LABOR FACTORS
FINAL


Crop	Hours For Task	Daily Work Hours	Peak Season Length (Work Days)
Apples	91.00	7.7	32.14
Berries	172.00	7.7	19.29
Blueberries	181.50	7.7	19.29
Christmas Trees	31.70	7.7	21.43
Cotton	2	7.7	20.71
Grapes	48.75	7.7	19.15
Head Cabbage	77.94	7.7	43.57
Lima Beans	9.00	7.7	24.00
Peaches	81.65	7.7	22.14
Peanuts	8.05	7.7	26.79
Pecans	15.00	7.7	43.57
Pumpkins	27.33	7.7	15.71
Snap Beans	37.92	7.7	32.78
Southern Peas	6.00	7.7	19.91
Squash	69.54	7.7	61.43
Sweet Corn	35.95	7.7	22.14
Sweet Potatoes	52.56	7.7	30.71
Tomatoes	200.65	7.7	30.71
Watermelons	67.93	7.7	30.00

Mississippi Estimates For MSFW Workers Only By County Final



Reforestation Statewide: 1,394
Grand Total -- MSFWs in Mississippi: 11,762

Mississippi Estimates For MSFW Workers And Non-Workers By County Final



Reforestation -- Workers and Non-Workers Statewide:	2,138
Grand Total -- MSFW Workers and Non-Workers in Mississippi:	18,191

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abt Associates, *Study of WIC Participant and Program Characteristics 1996, Final Report*, prepared for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, Office of Analysis and Evaluation, Alexandria, VA 1998.
- Aguirre International and the U.S. Department of Labor, "National Agricultural Workers Survey," Washington, D.C.
- Association of Farmworker Opportunity Programs, "National Farmworker Database," Arlington, VA.
- Economopoulos, Michael, South Eastern Forestry Contractors Association, "Options for Tree Planting Labor, (published in the *Forest Farmer*), Leslie, AR.
- Edward E. Judge and Sons, Inc., compiler, *The Directory of Canning, Freezing, Preserving Industries, 1998-99* Westminster, MD., 1998.
- Larson, Alice C. and Luis Plascencia, *Migrant Enumeration Project*, contract with the Project Advisory Group, Legal Services, Washington, D.C., 1993.
- Larson, Alice C., *Number and Characteristics of Migrants in Mississippi*, prepared for Central Mississippi Legal Services, Jackson, MS, 1992.
- Leland, Alfer, *Bullinger's 1997 Postal and Shippers Guide*, St. Louis, MO, 1997.
- Mississippi Department of Education, Migrant Education Program, "Identified Eligible Program Participants by County," Jackson, MS, 1998.
- Mississippi Employment Security Commission, "Estimates of MSFWs Employed in Mississippi," prepared by Ann LaGuan, 1998.
- Mississippi State University, Cooperative Extension Service, "Commercial Horticulture Acreages by Counties – 1998," Mississippi State, MS, 1998.
- Mississippi State University, Extension Service, *Planting Southern Pines, A Guide to Species Selection and Planting Techniques*, Mississippi State, MS, 1998.
- Nagel, David, Mississippi State University, Cooperative Extension Service, telephone conversation November 30, 1998.
- North Carolina State University, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, "Crop Budgets" Raleigh, NC, years vary.
- Parker, Michael, et. al, *High Density Apple Orchard Management*, North Carolina Cooperative Extension Service, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, 1998.
- Pennsylvania State University, *Pennsylvania Tree Fruit Production*, University Park, PA, 1998.
- Smith, Scott A. and Timothy G. Taylor, *Production Costs for Selected Florida Vegetables, 1996-97*, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, 1997.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, *Report on the Feasibility of Insuring Christmas Trees*, Washington, D.C., 1995.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, forest statistics by state and county (as published in various state specific *Forest Statistics* reports), from the internet web site, 1998.

- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, *Tree Planting in the United States* (1992-1996 annual reports), Washington, D.C.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service, *Usual Planting and Harvesting Dates for U.S. Field Crops*, Washington, D.C., 1997.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service, *Farm Labor Reports: Workers and Wages*, Washington, D.C., various years.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service, *1997 Census of Agriculture*, Washington, D.C., 1999.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Statistical Reporting Service, *Potatoes, Sweet Potatoes: Usual Dates for Planting, Harvesting and Marketing*, Washington, D.C., 1973.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Statistical Reporting Service, *Usual Planting and Harvesting Dates for Fresh Market and Processing Vegetables*, Washington, D.C., 1977.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Bureau of Primary Health Care, Migrant Health Program, "UDS Data," Bethesda, MD.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Health Resources and Services Administration, Bureau of Health Care Delivery and Assistance, Migrant Health Program, *An Atlas of State Profiles Which Estimate Number of Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers and Members of Their Families*, Rockville, MD., 1990.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Employment and Wages Monthly Employment", *ES 202* report, Washington, D.C., 1995-1997.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Program Economics, *Findings From the National Agricultural Workers Survey 1990*, Washington, D.C., 1991.
- United States Code*, "Title 42, The Public Health and Welfare, Chapter 6A, Public Health Service, Public Health Service Act, Title III, Part D, Section 330, Migrant Health."
- University of Arkansas, Cooperative Extension Service, "Tomatoes, Irrigated Fresh Market, " (crop budget), Little Rock, AR, 1995.
- University of Tennessee, Institute of Agriculture, Agricultural Extension Service, "Crop Budgets," Knoxville, TN.